

Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 11, and 21, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thibadeau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,432,542), hereinafter Thibadeau.

It is submitted that Thibadeau fails to teach or suggest the step of: “detecting a condition indicating relocation of said apparatus after a power interruption to said apparatus,” as recited by claim 1.

A problem addressed by the subject application is the loss of relevance of location information stored in a set top box or other emergency alert device after it has been set up, then powered down and relocated. To solve this problem, the subject application discloses a method of detecting a condition indicating relocation of the apparatus after a power interruption, enabling an output associated with the emergency alert function when relocation is detected, and enabling a user to provide updated information associated with the emergency alert function responsive to detecting the relocation. Thus, the user may, for instance, enter new location information or new alert preferences when a set top box detects that it has been relocated.

It is submitted that Thibadeau teaches a system where: “location specific messages or programming are generally broadcast and selectively filtered by user terminals which have encoded one or more arbitrary locations of interest. The area surrounding a user, a remote location, a route to be travelled or the like may be selected for receipt of local warnings, local commercial messages and the like. Transmitted messages contain information targeted to geographical groups of users, with location designation coding accompanying location-specific messages. A geographic location selection code is entered into a data processor coupled to the user's receiver to define the user's selected location(s) of interest. The processor receives the information segment and its designation code and compares the designated location to the selected one. Segments where the designated and selected points or areas overlap are processed, e.g., being displayed, stored or used to trigger a warning.” (Thibadeau Abstract)

While Thibadeau discloses presenting a menu to allow the user to provide location information to the set top unit and describes the set top unit receiving location information from a transmission, Thibadeau does not disclose detecting that the set top box has been relocated during a power interruption. With the system of Thibadeau, the user would need to re-run a setup routine himself to tell the set top box that it had been relocated. Therefore, the system of Thibadeau does not provide the advantages of the method described in the present application, which detects the relocation and then alerts the user enables the user to update the information if relocation is detected.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that Thibadeau fails to disclose “detecting a condition indicating relocation of said apparatus after a power interruption to said apparatus,” as recited by claim 1.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully asserted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Thibadeau that makes the present invention as claimed in claim 1 unpatentable. It is further submitted that independent claims 11 and 21 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Since dependent claims 3-10, 13-20, and 23-30 are dependent from allowable independent claims 11 and 21 respectfully, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 23 and 24, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thibadeau.

Claims 5-7, 15-17, and 25-27, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thibadeau as applied to claims 1, 11 and 21 above, and further in view of Lau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,592,173), hereinafter Lau.

Claims 8, 18 and 28, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thibadeau and Lau as applied to claims 5, 15 and 25 above, and further in view of Lamb (U.S. Patent No. 6,329,904).

Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 29, 30, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thibadeau as applied to claims 1, 11 and 21 above, and further in view of Lamb.

As dependent claims 3-10, 13-20, and 23-30 are dependent from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, which should be allowable for the reasons described above, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian j cromarty/

By:

Brian J Cromarty
Reg. No. L0027
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
November 14, 2008